

09/710,143

MS160275.1

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. A clean version of all pending claims is found at pages 2-5. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-2, 5-9, 13-16, and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 13-16, and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Amberg *et al.* (US 5,963,743). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Amberg *et al.* does not teach or suggest *each and every element* of the claimed invention.

For a prior art reference to anticipate, 35 U.S.C. §102 requires that "*each and every element* as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *In re Robertson*, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (*quoting Verdegaal Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co.*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)) (emphasis added).

The subject invention as claimed relates to configuring and / or setting up software systems based on *installation location* (e.g., *where the software system is being installed*). Information is acquired indicative of a computer *location* onto which application components are to be installed. (See pg. 2, ln. 25-26). The acquired *location information* is utilized to configure the software system. (See pg. 2, ln. 31-32). Thus, the subject invention provides systems and methods for tailoring software systems to provide desirable functionality based at least in part on *location information*. (See pg. 3, ln. 2-4).

Amberg *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of applicants' claimed invention. In particular, Amberg *et al.* does not teach or suggest a setup component that receives information indicative of a *location* scenario related to *where the software system is being installed*, configuration characteristics for the software

09/710,143

MS160275.1

system determined based at least in part on the *location* scenario as recited in independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 7, 8, and 15).

The Advisory Action contends "the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., 'installation location' which should be entailed 'location' as described per specification as pg. 2, ln. 25-26, 31-32 and page 3, ln. 2-4;) are not recited in the rejected claim(s)." Applicants' representative respectfully disagrees with such an assertion, noting that the subject claims recite that a setup component receives *information indicative of a location scenario related to where the software system is being installed*.

Moreover, Amberg *et al.* merely discloses utilizing a computer system configured to *sequence software installation and testing steps* to be run on a target system using component descriptors from a descriptor file. (See col. 4, ln. 1-10). By way of example, a customer places an *order* to purchase build-to-order target computer system. (See col. 4, ln. 50-51). Such *order* is converted into the descriptor file, which lists each hardware and software component to be installed onto target system. (See col. 4, ln. 61 – col. 5, ln. 1). A network is utilized, but merely allows a sequencing program to direct execution of the software installation and testing steps upon the target system in accordance with the requirements of the descriptor file. (See col. 5, ln. 8-19). Thus, Amberg *et al.* simply discloses configuring a target system solely according to an *order* and the network is merely utilized for communication. Amberg *et al.* is silent regarding configuration based at least in part on the *location* scenario, and does not teach or suggest receiving information indicative of a *location* scenario related to *where the software system is being installed* as recited in the applicants' claimed invention.

In view of at least the above, it is readily apparent that Amberg *et al.* does not anticipate or suggest the subject invention as recited in claims 1, 7, 8, and 15 (and claims 2, 5-6, 9, 13-14, 16, and 19-21 which respectively depend there from). Thus, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17-20 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Amberg *et al.* (US 5,963,743) in view of Jones *et al.* (US 5,666,501).

09/710,143

MS160275.1

It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Amberg *et al.* and Jones *et al.*, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the subject claims.

Jones *et al.* does not make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Amberg *et al.* with respect to independent claims 1, 8 and 15 (which claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17-20 directly or indirectly depend from). In particular, Jones *et al.* does not teach or suggest a setup component that receives information indicative of a *location* scenario related to *where the software system is being installed*, configuration characteristics for the software system determined based at least in part on the *location* scenario. Jones *et al.* merely teaches installing software stored on a second machine to a first machine in a distributed computing network. (See abstract). Therefore, the subject invention as recited in claims 3-4, 10-12, and 17-20 is not obvious over the combination of Amberg *et al.* and Jones *et al.* Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

09/710,143

MS160275.1

III. CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP


Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731